REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated March 24, 2006. Claims 12-13, 24-25, 29-34 and 38-39 are all the claims presently pending in the application. With this Response, no claims have been amended. No new matter has been introduced, thus, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Response To §102 And §103 Rejections

Claims 12-13, 24-25, 29-30, 32-33 and 38-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hug et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,806,078, hereafter "Hug") in view of Moran et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,786,814, hereafter "Moran"). The Applicants traverse the rejections noted above for the following reasons.

The present invention, as recited in independent claims 38 and 39, is directed to an information processing apparatus and method that include, in pertinent part, a control step or means for an application program that locate application data from a stored plurality of different sets of application data at time closest to received day and time information; and reproduce the state of an application program using the located application data. It is important to note that when each application program receives time information from another application program, it is possible to synchronize "time of application" to the time information received. (see, Applicants' disclosure, page 31, lines 6-12). After a detailed review of Hug and Moran, neither reference appears to teach nor suggest these features.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on Hug at col. 5, line 10 through col. 6, line 6 for teaching or suggesting the control step or means of the present invention. The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of Hug. Hug discloses generally a version management system for storing and retrieving changes to spreadsheets or word processing documents. In this system, an original version of each document and all alternative versions are stored in a delta format (i.e., storing only the difference from a prior version) within a common difference data file (see, Hug, Abstract).

The sections of Hug cited by the Examiner describe in detail how a document is stored in and retrieved from a library directory 38. As described, each document is stored as a set of variable-sized, delta-formatted data records representing characters, words, lines paragraphs or any other elementary portions of the document. Each version of a document, including the delta

version, can be checked-out of the library directory 38 by a user. Although Hug teaches or suggests the retrieval of a stored document, nothing in the reference teaches or suggests locating a stored document closest to day and time information received in, for example, a retrieval request. In fact, nothing in Hug even teaches or suggests that time or day information is used a basis of retrieval of a stored document.

Fig. 9 of Hug illustrates in more detail the check-out process of a document, which appears to further support the Applicants' contentions. In Fig. 9, a Version Open Dialogue box allows a user to perform a check-out procedure of a document from the library directory 38. The Version Open Dialogue box requires a user to provide the project, document and the version number/name for proper retrieval of the document (see also, Hug, col. 9, lines 35-45). Therefore, Hug fails to teach or suggest the claim interaction between application programs, wherein each application program receives time information from another application program in order to synchronize "time of application" to the time information received. The Applicants, therefore, maintain that Hug fails to teach or suggest all the features of the control step or means of the present invention; particularly with regard to the time aspect.

After a detailed review of Moran, this reference fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Hug to render obvious claims 38 and 39. Moran discloses generally a system for controlling the playback of a recorded session, which is controlled by a session access device. Additionally, coupled to the session access device, are a plurality of players for playing back timestreams. Although Moran describes playback (i.e., retrieval) of a recorded session, the playback of a session appears to be based on selecting an event for display (see, Moran, col. 3, lines 38-63). Nothing in the reference teaches or suggests locating a stored session closest to day and time information received in, for example, a playback request.

Therefore, in summary, Hug fails to provide any motivation to modify or combine its teaching with Moran to arrive at the present invention; particularly with regard to the time aspect of the recited control step or means. Additionally, even if it were appropriate to combine the teachings of Hug and Moran, the combination still fails to teach or suggest all the features of the control step or means of the present invention.

Therefore, independent claims 38 and 39 are clearly distinguishable over Hug in view of Moran. Likewise, dependent claims 12-13, 24-25, 29-34 are also believed to be distinguishable over Hug in view of Moran based on their respective dependencies.

Conclusions

In light of the above, the Applicants submit that all the claims are patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If any additional fees are due in connection with this application as a whole, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct such fees from deposit account no. 02-1818.

Respectfully submitted,

BY 

Thomas C. Basso
Reg. No. 46,541
Cust. No. 29175

Dated: June 23, 2006